

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JOE CLINARD,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. 3:19-cv-00975
v.	)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
	)	
KAREN WALLACE BOLTON LIVING	)	
TRUST, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 9), to which no Objections have been filed.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \* 2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, Case No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at \* 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, Case No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at \* 3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved.

Accordingly, as recommended in the Report and Recommendation, this action is **DISMISSED without prejudice** under Rule 4(m) for failure to timely effect service of process. The Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute final judgment for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE